UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,499	03/26/2004	Masayuki Tsuda	9683/179	8154

27879   7590   03/09/2009
INDIANAPOLIS OFFICE 27879
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2033

EXAMINER
SAMS, MATTHEW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/11/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 5 that *the data being stored as described by Kurokawa is not representative of respective events between a start of suspension of operation of the application program and resumption of operation of the application program at an end of the suspension* (Page 14), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

While the Examiner agrees that the novelty of Kurokawa is the ability to playback a video on a mobile phone, pause playback of the video because of an incoming call and once the call ends, resume playback of the video from the paused point. However, it is well within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the main purpose of a mobile phone is the ability to receive/notify a user of an incoming call and that programs operating on the mobile phone will operate similarly to the playback of a video (*i.e.* be paused, complete the call, resume) as described by Kurokawa. This can be seen for example in the previous art of record, Hikishima (US-7,190,977) that enables a user to pause the playback of a videogame in order to answer a phone call, then resume playback of the videogame once the call has ended.

Further, it is well within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize the ability of mobile phones to display a call history, as described by Alford (Col. 3 lines 58-65) and similarly in Kurokawa. (Col. 13 lines 10-14 and Col. 13 line 63 through Col. 14 line 4) The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history of

Alford, interrupted by an incoming call, answers the incoming call, ends the call (all as described by Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would be displayed as well), which corresponds to a resumed application program (call history) that is configured to adjust in accordance with the at least one of the event data indications (incoming calls, whether answered or missed) to be responsive to the cause of the suspension (resuming the viewing of the call history list once the call has ended with the new calls).

3.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 5 that *the combination of Kurokawa and Alford is improper since the addition of Alford to Kurokawa renders Kurokawa unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and/or impermissibly changes the principal of operation of Kurokawa* (Page 15), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford does not stop Kurokawa from "moving picture reproduction", the Examiner is merely suggesting that the program of focus in the above example is not a "moving picture reproduction" but instead displaying a call history as described by Alford.

4.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 5 that *Modification of Kurokawa with Alford as asserted in the office action results in suspension of Kurokawa's reproduction of a moving picture, and launching of Alford's display of call history* (Page 16), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        Kurokawa teaches in Fig. 6 [6j and 6o] that the mobile phone is capable of maintaining and displaying a call history. The Examiner views this as the reason for

Kurokawa to be able to incorporate Alford's ability to view call history as a stand-alone feature, much the same way the user can already view a "moving picture reproduction".

The Examiner's combination is not what the Applicant is asserting, *i.e.* suspension of Kurokawa's reproduction of a moving picture, and launching of Alford's display of call history. The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history as described by Alford, interrupted by an incoming call, answers the incoming call, ends the call (all as described by Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would be displayed as well), which corresponds to a resumed application program (call history) that is configured to adjust in accordance with the at least one of the event data indications (incoming calls, whether answered or missed) to be responsive to the cause of the suspension (resuming the viewing of the call history list once the call has ended with the new calls).

5.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 29 that *neither Kurokawa nor Alford teach or suggest a resumed application program operable to generate any form of message, and thus quite clearly cannot teach or suggest generation of such a message in response to receipt of a delivered stored event* (Page 17), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history as described by Alford, has the viewing interrupted by an incoming call, answers the

incoming call, ends the call (all as described by Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would be displayed as well), which corresponds to a resumed application program (call history) that is configured to adjust in accordance with the at least one of the event data indications (incoming calls, whether answered or missed) to be responsive to the cause of the suspension (resuming the viewing of the call history list once the call has ended with the new calls). Further, the Examiner views the updating of the call history as meeting the "generate the message in response to receipt of the delivered stored event data".

6.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 30 that *neither Kurokawa nor Alford teach or suggest a processor configured to maintain as unchanged data input by a user and temporarily stored in a terminal device during operation of an application program* (Page 17), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        Kurokawa teaches the ability to "Accept Settings For Reproduction" from the user (Fig. 2 [2a] and Fig. 6 [6a]) that are used for viewing the moving pictures throughout the interrupting/resuming process described in Fig. 6. Although this differs from the scenario described above for the independent claims, the Examiner views Kurokawa's teachings relating to the moving picture reproduction to be applicable to other programs that are capable of being run on the mobile phone.

7.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 33 that *none of the cited references teach or suggest resumption of a suspended application program after a specified time has elapsed* (Page 17), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Monnes teaches a system and method for automatically updating outdated messages or deleting obsolete messages for an electronic device. Further, Monnes teaches in Fig. 6 the displaying of a pop-up window [56], detecting an event [62] and deleting the pop-up window [64], which corresponds to resuming a suspended program (not displaying a pop-up window) after a specified time has elapsed (Fig. 6 loops until an even is detected [62]) following display of the message (pop-up window on display).

8.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 34, the Applicant's argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 29 and the rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

9.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 36, the Examiner views the Applicant's argument as being untimely. The Examiner's basic assertion that the use of flags, identifiers and tables as being well known to one of ordinary skill in the art has been in the Examiner's responses since 4/14/2008. Regardless, upon further review, Kurokawa teaches the use of a memory section that includes storing the correlated data due to the call reception information that interrupted the playback of moving picture reproduction. (Col. 13 lines 10-15)

10.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 8, the Applicant's argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 5 and the rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

11.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 37, the Applicant's argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 30 and the rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

12.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 9, the Examiner apologizes for the typo.   The office action should have read "29", not just "9". Accordingly, the Examiner's remarks regarding claims 5 & 29 above correspond to the Applicant's arguments for claim 9.

13.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 23, the Applicant's argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 30 and the rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

14.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claims 25 and 26, the Examiner views the Applicant's argument as being untimely.   The Examiner's basic assertion that the use of flags, identifiers and tables as being well known to one of ordinary skill in the art has been in the Examiner's responses since 4/14/2008. Regardless, upon further review, Kurokawa teaches the use of a memory section that includes storing the correlated data due to the call reception information that interrupted the playback of moving picture reproduction. (Col. 13 lines 10-15)

15.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 27 that the *Applicant also respectfully traverses the assertions on page 6 of the office action regarding storage and maintenance of an application in volatile memory* (Pages 21-22), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        Volatile memory is memory that loses anything that is stored in it once power is loss. RAM is volatile memory. ROM is memory that can withstand power loss yet retain the stored information. If required, further information can be seen in the definition of RAM on page 682 of Newton's Telecom Dictionary 20th Edition by Harry Newton that

"The problem with RAM memory is that it's volatile. This means when power is turned

off (or power glitches occur) RAM memory is erased."

16.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 28, the Applicant's

argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 33 and the

rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

17.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 39, the Applicant's

argument are viewed as being the same as those stated above in claim 30 and the

rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation above.

18.   In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies

(i.e., "plurality of different screens for display to a user" [Pages 22-23]) are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

        The Applicant's claim only requires one screen for display to a user. The

Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video

as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history of Alford, interrupted

by an incoming call, answers the incoming call, ends the call (all as described by

Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be

updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list

and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would

be displayed as well).

19.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 41 (Pages 23-24), the Examiner views the Applicant's argument as being untimely.   The Examiner's basic assertion that the use of flags, identifiers and tables as being well known to one of ordinary skill in the art has been in the Examiner's responses since 4/14/2008. Regardless, upon further review, Kurokawa teaches the use of a memory section that includes storing the correlated data due to the call reception information that interrupted the playback of moving picture reproduction. (Col. 13 lines 10-15)

The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history of Alford, interrupted by an incoming call, answers the incoming call, ends the call (all as described by Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would be displayed as well), which corresponds to a resumed application program (call history) that is configured to adjust in accordance with the at least one of the event data indications (incoming calls, whether answered or missed) to be responsive to the cause of the suspension (resuming the viewing of the call history list once the call has ended with the new calls).

20.   In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 42 that *instructions stored in the memory to generate a message originated from the resumed application in response to the extracted even data, wherein the message is configured to notify a user of the first predetermined event is not taught by Kurokawa nor Alford* (Page 25), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner's combination of Kurokawa in view of Alford is that instead of viewing a video as described by Kurokawa, if the user is displaying the call history as described by Alford, has the viewing interrupted by an incoming call, answers the incoming call, ends the call (all as described by Kurokawa in Fig. 6) and then resumes viewing the call history, the call history will be updated as to the reason of the interruption (*i.e.* the incoming call is added to the list and if any other incoming calls were ignored during the call, those missed calls would be displayed as well), which corresponds to a resumed application program (call history) that is configured to adjust in accordance with the at least one of the event data indications (incoming calls, whether answered or missed) to be responsive to the cause of the suspension (resuming the viewing of the call history list once the call has ended with the new calls). Further, the Examiner views the updating of the call history as meeting the "generate the message in response to receipt of the delivered stored event data".

/M. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2617